

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA**

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

**2002 GMOC ANNUAL REPORT**

**Review Period 7/1/01 to 6/30/02**  
***And Five Year Forecast to December 2007***

**Accepted and Approved by the City of Chula Vista Planning Commission**  
**June 12, 2003**

**Accepted and Approved by the Chula Vista City Council**  
**June 12, 2003**

**Commission Members**

Arthur M. Garcia, Chair (Education)  
William Tripp, Vice Chair (Environmental)  
Rafael Munoz (Eastern Territories)  
Michael Spethman (Center City)  
Steve Palma (Southwest)  
David W. Krogh (Sweetwater/Bonita)  
Richard Arroyo (Business)  
Gary Lee Nordstrom (Development)  
Marco Polo Cortes (Planning Commission)

**Staff**

Daniel Forster, Growth Management Coordinator  
Cherryl Cisneros, Management Assistant  
Terrance Smith, Planning Intern  
  
Mark Stephens, Principal Planner

**June, 2003**

June 5, 2003

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council  
Members of the Planning Commission  
City of Chula Vista

FROM: Arthur Garcia, Chairperson  
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: 2002 GMOC Annual Report (July 2001 to June 30, 2002, and Five Year Forecast)

---

The GMOC is appreciative of the time and professional expertise given by the various City department staff as well as the school districts, water authorities, and Air Pollution Control District in helping us complete this year's annual report. The comprehensive written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC illustrate the commitment of these dedicated professionals to serving the Chula Vista community. Special thanks to Dan Forster, Cherryl Cisneros, Mark Stephens, and Terry Smith who provided excellent staff support.

I would like to recognize the commissioners of the GMOC: Vice Chair, Bill Tripp, Rafael Munoz, Michael Spethman, Steve Palma, David Krogh, Marco Cortes, Gary Nordstrom, and Richard Arroyo. This dedicated and diverse team of citizens read numerous reports, listened to detailed presentations, and participated in hours of thoughtful discussion about the impact of development on the "quality of life" in Chula Vista.

The underlying theme of this year's GMOC process is that we are changing in three specific ways with more changes to come.

First, and for the first time, the GMOC cultivated public participation with two public outreach events. Each event brought out between 70 and 90 participants.

Second, our focus has become more proactive, emphasizing the next 5 years as opposed to the previous fiscal year.

Third, although not as obvious, growth is occurring in the west. We are taking an ever-closer look at the impacts that this situation is causing.

When considering further changes we are left with a fundamental question. Are we tasked with growth management by monitoring quality of life indicators, or are we expected to monitor the impacts of growth *and* the quality of life overall? Technically, the answer is the former, but from the comments we have heard many in the community expect the latter. One of the basic objectives of the City's growth management program was to insure that eastern growth did not erode the quality of life that the west side of the community had become accustomed to. In example, the GMOC can say that

drainage in the east is, or is not, keeping pace with growth and recommend appropriate actions. On the other hand, we are not empowered to comment on the decayed drainage system in the west as that decay is not specifically growth related. We have commented on the state of drainage in the west anyway, but it is not within our charge to do so. The dilemma; should we not have a system that monitors the quality of life on both the east and west side of the City regardless of the cause, be it growth, service levels, or just inadequate upgrades and maintenance?

Let me be clear on two points.

First the GMOC membership is not unified in an answer to this and continues to struggle with defining our role.

Second, even if there was a unified position, the GMOC acknowledges that the east and west are different and that different quality of life standards and implementation methods for each area would be appropriate.

As the City Council has stated, the City's growth management program needs a top to bottom review. We are in agreement.

As for this reporting period, it is not a surprise that the City of Chula Vista continues to experience unprecedented growth. This growth reflects the prosperity of the region but if not managed poses a threat to our quality of life. This underscores the importance of managed growth to assure the continued "quality of life" the citizens of Chula Vista appreciate and have come to expect. The GMOC recognizes the complexity of this issue and commends the City Council for its commitment to managed growth and the actions taken on April 15, 2003 implementing a permit monitoring system.

The GMOC found nine of the eleven threshold standards in compliance, two out of compliance, two potential future non-compliance, and has issued two Statements of Concern.

Thresholds not in compliance:

#### Police

The Police response time threshold while not being met, was within 12 calls of achievement. This represents virtual compliance. The GMOC notes continued improvement and anticipates threshold achievement in the next reporting cycle.

#### Fire/EMS

After reaching the threshold level last year, the Fire/EMS response times made a surprise decline. One of the factors is that fire station development is not keeping pace with growth, although a new station will open in September 2003.

Potential for future non-compliance:

#### Traffic

In addition to Fire/EMS (discussed above) Traffic is listed as having a future non-compliance issue. It is expected that with the Permit Monitoring Program, including traffic enhancements in place, traffic for the next three years should be within threshold standards. After that point,

the completion of SR-125 should provide the necessary capacity to avoid a traffic threshold failure. To be conservative, and to reflect continued community concern, the GMOC has determined that a potential traffic threshold failure exists. The GMOC will evaluate the situation on a year to year basis.

In addition, the GMOC is recommending that there be a community workshop on traffic, that the relationship of freeway traffic and the City's traffic threshold be evaluated, and for an investigation on a transit related threshold be conducted.

#### Statement of Concern:

##### Schools

Statements of concern are being issued for both elementary and high schools regarding construction schedules relative to student population growth. The City and the school districts are taking appropriate measures, but there remain a potentially serious conditions that the GMOC must recognize.

In addition, the GMOC believes that the recommendations of the Schools Task Force need to be taken seriously and acted upon as appropriate.

#### Summary of other findings:

##### Parks and Recreation

With the Parks Master Plan in place, it is now time to establish a Park and Recreation quality of Life Threshold Standard for western Chula Vista. This standard is not envisioned as being the same as stipulated for the east. There must instead be an examination of what will bring an equitable level of service to the west, to be reasonable, and achievable over a number of years based upon a practical financing scheme.

The following report highlights the eleven threshold standards, with the issues and recommendations to the City Council.

I look forward to the joint City Council, Planning Commission and GMOC workshop on June 12, 2002.

**CITY OF CHULA VISTA  
GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION  
2002 ANNUAL REPORT**

---

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>1.0</u></b>	<b><u>INTRODUCTION .....</u></b>	<b><u>2</u></b>
1.1	The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC).....	2
1.2	Review Process .....	2
1.3	Growth Forecast.....	3
1.4	Changes In The GMOC.....	3
1.4.1	Future Orientation.....	3
1.4.2	Western Chula Vista .....	4
1.4.3	Greater Community Participation .....	5
1.4.4	Threshold Evaluation .....	5
1.5	Top to Bottom Review .....	5
<b><u>2.0</u></b>	<b><u>THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY .....</u></b>	<b><u>6</u></b>
<b><u>3.0</u></b>	<b><u>THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE .....</u></b>	<b><u>9</u></b>
3.1	FISCAL.....	9
3.1.1	DIF Fees.....	9
3.2	AIR QUALITY.....	10
3.2.1	Air Quality Improvement Plan Guidelines .....	12
3.3	SEWER.....	13
3.3.1	Timely Construction of the Salt Creek Trunk Sewer .....	13
3.4	WATER.....	15
3.4.1	Water Distribution System Capacity .....	15
3.5	LIBRARIES.....	17
3.5.1	Library Building Plan .....	17
3.6	DRAINAGE.....	18
3.6.1	Unfunded Drainage Projects in Western Chula Vista .....	18
3.7	PARKS & RECREATION.....	19
3.7.1	Facility Adequacy .....	19
3.7.2	Equivalence of Recreational Opportunities .....	19
3.7.3	Completion of Greenbelt Master Plan .....	20
3.7.4	Joint Use of City/School Recreation Facilities .....	20
3.8	POLICE .....	22
3.8.1	Performance Targets .....	23
3.8.2	Removal of False Alarms from Response Times .....	23
3.8.3	Additional Measures to Reduce Response Time .....	24
3.8.4	False Alarms .....	26

<b>3.9</b>	<b>FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.....</b>	<b>29</b>
3.9.1	Maintaining Threshold.....	30
3.9.2	Monitoring Targets .....	31
<b>3.10</b>	<b>TRAFFIC.....</b>	<b>32</b>
3.10.1	Timely Construction of SR-125 .....	32
3.10.2	Traffic Enhancement Opportunities .....	32
3.10.3	Traffic Monitoring Program Reporting .....	33
3.10.4	Traffic Thresholds and Measurement .....	34
3.11.5	Highway Traffic and Quality of Life.....	34
3.11.6	Transit Threshold .....	35
<b>3.11</b>	<b>SCHOOLS .....</b>	<b>36</b>
3.11.1	Monitoring Growth.....	37
3.11.2	School Construction – Elementary Schools .....	38
3.11.3	School Construction - Middle and High Schools .....	39
3.11.4	The Schools Task Force .....	40
<b><u>4.0</u></b>	<b><u>APPENDICES.....</u></b>	<b><u>41</u></b>
4.1	Appendix A – Recommendations and Implementing Actions .....	41

---

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

In November 1987, the City Council adopted the original Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista establishing “quality-of-life” indicators for eleven public facility and service topics. The Policy addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), a “threshold” or standard, and implementation measures. Adherence to these citywide standards is intended to preserve and enhance both the environment and residents’ quality of life as growth occurs. To provide an independent, annual, City-wide Threshold Standards compliance review, the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was created. It is composed of nine members representing each of the City’s four major geographic areas, a member of the Planning Commission, and a cross section of interests including education, environment, business, and development.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three time frames:

1. A fiscal year cycle to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations, which may have budget implications, therefore the report focuses on the previous fiscal year for detailed data collection, which in this case is July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002.
2. Pertinent issues identified during the second half of 2002 and early 2003 are also addressed. This is to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events.
3. A five-year forecast covering the period from January 2003 through December 2007 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns. This assures that the GMOC has a future orientation. The GMOC 5 Year Forecast is included in Appendix B.

During this process, the GMOC encourages each City Department and outside agency, which has responsibility for reporting on the threshold status, to review the appropriateness of the threshold and whether new thresholds and or standards should be considered.

## 1.2 Review Process

The GMOC held 11 regular meetings from September 2002 through May 2003. In addition, GMOC members participated in a City field trip, and two Public Outreach Events, and the Joint Workshop with the City Council and Planning Commission scheduled for June 12, 2003. 8 City Departments and 5 outside agencies completed threshold questionnaires. GMOC members reviewed the questionnaires, and where necessary, asked department or agency representatives to appear in person to answer questions. The GMOC determined whether it would be appropriate to issue a “statement of concern” for issues dealing with “outside agencies” or to make other recommendations regarding each threshold. Once individual threshold reviews were completed, this report was prepared for presentation at a joint workshop with the GMOC, the Planning Commission and City Council.

**At the City Council, Planning Commission and GMOC joint workshop, as specified by the Growth Management Program document, the GMOC requests that the Annual Report be accepted and both the Planning Commission and City Council approve the recommendations contained therein.**

## **1.3 Growth Forecast**

In October 2002 the GMOC “Preliminary” Five Year Growth Forecast was issued. This forecast was issued to provide departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the magnitude of residential growth to be anticipated over the over the next five years. Each department and outside agency was then asked how their respective public facility/service would be able to accommodate that growth. The forecast from January 2003 through December 2007, indicated an additional 12,500 residential units would be constructed in the city, for an annual average of 2,500 units.

One of the assumptions of that forecast was that “Building caps are not imposed on development”. In essence, the Permit Monitoring Program adopted by the City Council on April 15, 2003 has imposed such a system to be applied over the next 3 years (April 2003 through March 2006). The Permit Monitoring system will lower the number of permits relative to the forecast over that selected 3 year period. However, as the GMOC forecast is for a five-year period, units that were forestalled by the Permit Monitoring Program may after March 2006 come forward. In addition, to be conservative, it is prudent to maintain the estimate of 12,500 residential units over the next 5 years so that facility and service levels are measured against a higher standard. Annual updates will be provided.

## **1.4 Changes In The GMOC**

Over the last two years the GMOC has strived to become a more dynamic and responsive body. In last year’s GMOC Annual Report and presentation, several initiatives to change the GMOC were brought to the attention of the Planning Commission and City Council. This year there are an additional array of recommendations throughout the report that seek to enhance the GMOC’s ability to function effectively and respond to community concerns.

The changes brought to the attention of the Planning Commission and City Council last year were initiatives to:

- (1) shift to a more future oriented and proactive posture,
- (2) provide a greater emphasis on western Chula Vista, and
- (3) obtain greater community participation in the growth management process .

In addition, the current set of recommendations contains various changes within several critical thresholds, including Parks and Recreation, Police, Fire/EMS, and Traffic.

### **1.4.1 Future Orientation**

Within the growth management program there is the provision for a future orientation. The perception by many was that the GMOC only took into consideration what occurred in the previous fiscal year. To direct attention to the future, the Annual Report has been changed in two ways. There are now two summary tables for how thresholds are met, one for the previous fiscal year period and the other covering a five-year forecast, in this case the calendar years from 2003 through 2007. These tables provide a clear delineation between how thresholds were achieved in the past and how they are expected to do in the future.



The second formatting change is when each of the thresholds is introduced in the body of the report. Traditionally, a statement indicating how the thresholds fared in the previous fiscal year was indicated. In the current report, two statements are offered, one with the “current” evaluation and a second with a “future” evaluation for how the GMOC believes the threshold will be maintained over the next five years.

While in some ways cosmetic, this change in presentation sends a clear message to the community that the GMOC is future oriented and is recommending proactive measures that will assist in thresholds being met.

## **1.4.2 Western Chula Vista**

The conventional interpretation of growth is that it comes with new homes and commercial industrial activities. In this regard, Chula Vista’s eastern areas have been recognized as where growth is taking place. Corresponding to this growth has been a considerable amount of planning and investment in public infrastructure (financed in large part by the new home owners.) In fact, the creation of Chula Vista’s growth management program was part of the planning effort to insure that this new eastern growth did not diminish the quality of life that residents of Chula Vista had become accustomed.

The GMOC is shifting the focus of attention from eastern Chula Vista to the west. Growth in the east remains considerable and is expected to continue. However, this growth is taking place within planned communities with a financing/development impact fee structure that helps assure proper and timely provision of public infrastructure and services. There remain significant issues with sewer, traffic and schools, but these are largely a timing issue.

The City now faces a dilemma, in that growth is also occurring in western Chula Vista. Most of this growth is not a product of new housing but through demographic change. In short, there are more persons per household and an increase in the number of families that share a residence. The dilemma is that while the public infrastructure required by growth in the east can be financed through “development impact fees” or DIFs, supporting the infrastructure needs of growth occurring through demographic change cannot be financed as easily. Ironically, it is this absence of more conventional growth in the west that is making public improvements financed through development impact fees a problem. This is compounded by the fact that some of the facilities in the west are ageing, and that expansion is difficult as the area is largely fully developed. The prospect of infill, redevelopment, and intensification of land uses brings opportunities for financing public facilities. But this development must also be consistent with quality of life standards.

**The GMOC formally recognizes that there are growth related impacts in the west and will seek to apply thresholds and standards that are both reasonable and result in maintaining an acceptable quality of life. Maintaining quality of life standards for our western residents is as important as in the east.**

One small step in this direction was spending half of the GMOC’s annual field trip in the west visiting sites with problems and those offering development opportunities. In addition, as described later, the GMOC is investigating additional threshold measures, and looks forward to working with the Department of Community Development and the newly created position of Western Chula Vista Development Manager. The GMOC will recommend tailored quality of life threshold standards for western Chula Vista that both maintain the quality of life are appropriate and implementable

### **1.4.3 Greater Community Participation**

The GMOC sought to bring the presence and role of the GMOC to the attention of the community and to hear directly from residents about concerns. This has been addressed during this year's GMOC process by holding two "Public Events" at locations within the community, one in western Chula Vista and the other in eastern Chula Vista. All of the GMOC meetings are open to the public, but these public events were intended to provide a specific forum where the community can interact with the GMOC.

**It is significant to note that these public events were the first of their kind, and will be held in the future.**

The first public event was held on January 9, 2003. This event was held to better inform the community on the role of the GMOC and to hear from the community regarding their growth related concerns. The event drew an estimated attendance of 75 residents. The second event was held on April 24, 2003 and was an opportunity for the community to respond to the draft GMOC recommendations and to indicate where additional attention should be placed. A group of over 80 residents was estimated to be in attendance. A write-up for each of the events is included in Appendix B.

### **1.4.4 Threshold Evaluation**

In an effort to respond to resident concerns and to improve the effectiveness of the GMOC process, several recommended changes are being proposed within this year's Annual Report. In summary, they are:

- a threshold for park acreage for western Chula Vista needs to be established;
- performance targets other than response times for Police and Fire/EMS;
- removal of false alarm calls from police response time calculation;
- alternative ways of measuring traffic should be explored;
- the impact of highway congestion on city traffic needs to be evaluated;
- explore the possibility of a transit related threshold;
- modifying the school threshold to a 5 year forecast period;
- seriously consider the growth management related recommendations of the Schools Task Force.

## **1.5 Top to Bottom Review**

The changes that the GMOC has instituted, and is recommending, are consistent with the need for a "top to bottom" review of the overall growth management program as recognized by Council. Our first recommendation is therefore:

**Recommendation:** That the City Council directs the City Manager to provide sufficient staff and supporting resources to facilitate a thorough review of the growth management program and that the GMOC is a vital part of the review process.

## 2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

PRELIMINARY 2002 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/01 THROUGH 6/30/02		
Topic	Threshold Not Met	Threshold Met
Fiscal		X
Air Quality		X
Sewer		X
Water		X
Libraries		X
Drainage		X
Parks & Recreation		
<i>Land</i>		X
<i>Facilities</i>		X
Police	X	
Fire/EMS	X	
Traffic		X
Schools		
<i>Chula Vista Elementary</i>		X
<i>Sweetwater Union High School District</i>		X

**PRELIMINARY 2002 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY  
FIVE YEAR ASSESSMENT  
January 2003 through December 2007**

Issue	Threshold Will Be Met	Threshold Likely Met	Potential for Future Non- Compliance	Pending Threshold Standard Amendments	Statement of Concern	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
Fiscal		X				
Air Quality		X				
Sewer		X				
Water		X				
Libraries		X				X
Drainage		X				
Parks and Recreation						
<i>Land</i>	X			X		
<i>Facilities</i>		X		X		
Police		X				X
Fire/EMS			X			X
Traffic			X			X
Schools						
<i>Chula Vista Elementary</i>			X		X	
<i>Sweetwater Union High School District</i>			X		X	

## 3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE

### 3.1 FISCAL

**Threshold:** The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

#### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**Current**

*In Compliance*

**Future:**

*Threshold Likely Met*

---

#### 3.1.1 DIF Fees

**Issue:** Collections and expenditures of DIF revenues have been sufficient to ensure that necessary infrastructure and services are available to support the demands of new growth. In addition, the GMOC was provided with a presentation detailing the basis for the recent Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) increase.

**Recommendation:** No recommendations at this time.

## 3.2 AIR QUALITY

### Threshold:

#### The GMOC Shall Be Provided With An Annual Report Which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the City's development regulations, policies, and procedures relate to, and/or are consistent with current applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the City toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the City has achieved compliance.

The City shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Quality Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the affect of those efforts/programs on the City of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

#### CURRENT:

*In Compliance*

#### FUTURE

*Threshold Likely Met*

---

### Discussion:

In addition to the Air Quality Improvement Plans that are required by the growth management ordinance for all projects over 50 units, the City continues to implement several of the measures recommended in the CO2 Reduction Plan adopted by City Council on November 14, 2000. A selection of those on-going measures is listed below.

- 1 – Purchase of Alternative Fuel Vehicles, including:
  - Operating Transit Bus CNG Fueling and Maintenance Facility at Corp Yard
  - Public Access CNG Fueling Facility at Corp Yard
  - 40 New CNG Busses
  - Five CNG Vehicles: 4 Vans and 1 Car
  - Four Neighborhood Electric Cars (2 leased)
  - On road demonstration of world's first zinc fuel cell car in June 2002
- 2 – Green Power, Renewable Energy Efforts include:
  - Council approved 10 kw PV system for Nature Center – 2003.
  - Pending Council approval, and California Energy Commission (CEC) approval to reallocate grant funding for additional 10 kw PV system at new Public Works Yard – 2003.
  - Council approved 30 kw PV system for new Police HQ – 2003/04.
  - Staff to investigate City aggregation program to purchase green electricity for all Chula Vista electricity users in 2003/04.
  - Staff to evaluate installation of 1MW PV for Corp Yard.
- 3 – Municipal Clean Fuel Demonstration Project
  - The City is continuing to work with SunLine to demonstrate hydrogen electrolyzer and hydrogen fuel cell bus in 2003 using \$1 million in funding from the Department Of Energy (DOE) and the CEC.
  - Expanded project scope will procure up to four fuel cell busses for a two-year demonstration for the San Diego region with Chula Vista as the anchor.
- 4 – Municipal Building Upgrades and Trip Reduction
  - Facility and infrastructure retrofits are generating savings of 4.7 MW-hrs/yr.
  - City also replaced 24 refrigerators with EnergyStar rated units.
  - Past retrofits include upgrading lights, many HVAC systems and other appliances with energy-saving devices. Additional improvements will be made as major capital items are scheduled to be replaced or refurbished.
  - The Building Division's eastern office and permitting process via the Internet continues to result in trip reduction by City employees and the public.
- 5 – Bicycle Integration with Transit and Employment
  - Encourages employers and transit providers to provide bike storage at major transit stops and employment areas and includes bike racks on buses. Employers are also encouraged to provide showers at major transit nodes.

#### 6 – Municipal Life-Cycle Purchasing Standards

- This measure involves the inclusion of life-cycle energy costs as a selection criterion in a comprehensive purchasing policy for energy-consuming equipment. The policy has lead to the purchase of a number of Energy Star appliances and building design or equipment changes that promote energy efficiency.

### 3.2.1 Air Quality Improvement Plan Guidelines

#### Issues:

Since 1991 the Growth Management Ordinance has required that all major development projects (50 dwelling units or greater) include Air Quality Improvement Plans (AQIP). The Plans are prepared to address State and Federal mandates regarding air quality. As a result of the CO<sub>2</sub> Reduction Plan the City initiated a pilot study leading to preparation of the AQIP guidelines. In summary, the pilot study involved the development of a computer model to evaluate the relative effectiveness of applying various site design and energy conservation features in new development projects. The pilot study analyzed Otay Ranch Village Eleven and Six, and Eastlake III SPA projects and will result in preparation of AQIPs for these SPAs.

The pilot study was completed and the three SPA plan AQIPs were developed based on the study results. The AQIPs were adopted on August 13, 2002.

The establishment of formal guidelines for the preparation of AQIPs based on the pilot study results is now underway. The guidelines are scheduled for presentation to Council by the end of June 2003. Staff will also review and determine any necessary amendments to the Growth Management Ordinance and any other related Codes or documents.

#### Recommendation:

The GMOC continues to endorse the development of updated guidelines for the AQIP. Any proposed change to the Growth Management Ordinance should be brought before the GMOC for comment.



### 3.3 SEWER

**Threshold:**

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Authority with a 12-18 month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the City's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth, or the City Public Works Department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include:
  - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
  - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth.
  - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
  - d. Other relevant information.

The Authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

**THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**CURRENT**

*In Compliance*

**FUTURE**

*Threshold Likely Met*

---

#### 3.3.1 Timely Construction of the Salt Creek Trunk Sewer

**Issues:**

Construction of the Salt Creek Trunk Sewer segments has been identified as necessary to serve growth over the next five to seven years. Until the Salt Creek Trunk Sewer is installed, new development in the Poggi Canyon basin must temporarily pump sewage to the Telegraph Canyon Trunk sewer. Unless the Salt Creek Trunk Sewer comes on line, costly upgrades will be needed to the Telegraph Canyon Trunk Sewer to accommodate additional pumped flows. Currently the developments served by the Poggi Canyon sewer have limits placed on the number of

units that can be built until the Salt Creek Sewer is completed. The estimated cost for the Salt Creek Trunk Sewer is \$18 million.

**Recognition:**

It is recognized that the City is pursuing an aggressive construction program for the Salt Creek Sewer, as indicated in the current schedule:

Phase 1 - From Industrial Blvd. to I-805 (Completed)

Phase 2 - From Industrial Blvd. past I-5 to West Frontage Rd.  
Construction Schedule - October 2002 through September 2003;

Phase 3 & 4 - From Interstate I-805 to Olympic Parkway  
Construction Schedule - August 2002 through May 2003.

## 3.4 WATER

### Threshold:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the City a service availability letter from the Water District for each project.
2. The City shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12-18 month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:
  - a. Water availability to the City and Planning Area, considering both short and long term perspectives.
  - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed.
  - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth.
  - d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
  - e. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

#### CURRENT

*In Compliance*

#### FUTURE

*Threshold Likely Met*

---

### 3.4.1 Water Distribution System Capacity

#### Issue:

In western Chula Vista the ability of the existing water distribution system to support land use in-fill and intensification is limited. The aging water system is between 40 and 50 years old and was built to a standard much lower than today's fire fighting flow requirements. What are now undersized pipes proliferate in the western portion of the city. Such a state of infrastructure will have a limiting effect on development

and may lead to substandard conditions given recent trends in a shift to larger household sizes.

**Recommendation:**

That the City work in cooperation with the Sweetwater Authority in identifying strategic water distribution improvements and funding mechanisms.

**Issue:**

A supplemental set of 3 questions was sent to the Otay Water District on April 30, 2003. In part, these questions were issued to track capital expenditures as a means of better quantifying progress toward meeting threshold standards. A response by the Otay Water District has been provided, but due to the late timing of the request, a review by the GMOC was not possible prior to the conclusion of this years review cycle. The GMOC will continue with this review during the coming fiscal year.

## 3.5 LIBRARIES

**Threshold:** The City shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by buildout. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the City will not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

#### CURRENT

##### *In Compliance*

Actual: 544 gross square feet per 1,000 population.

#### FUTURE

##### *Threshold Likely Met, Possible Temporary Failure*

---

### 3.5.1 Library Building Plan

**Issues:** The Library Master Plan calls for the construction of a 30,000 square foot full-service, regional library in Rancho Del Rey by 2005. This library would be constructed on City-owned property located at East H Street and Paseo Ranchero. This library is expected to be open by either 2005 or 2006. It is possible that given the population growth of the community a temporary library threshold failure may occur.

**Recommendation:** That the City continue to actively pursue the Rancho Del Rey Library Planning/Building Plan Program and place as a priority the identification of adequate construction funding by the target completion date of 2005 or 2006 at the latest.

## 3.6 DRAINAGE

**Threshold:** Stormwater flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering standards.

The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the City's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet the goals and objectives listed above.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

#### CURRENT

*In Compliance*

#### FUTURE

*Threshold Likely Met*

---

### 3.6.1 Unfunded Drainage Projects in Western Chula Vista

**Issues:** The GMOC has consistently requested Council to authorize additional funds for the rehabilitation of drainage projects in western Chula Vista. Some of the projects date back to 1964. Historically the City has allocated funds in the \$300,000 to \$500,000 range to address drainage concerns. This amount is inadequate.

It is the understanding of the GMOC that a funding request is going to Council as part of the budget package requesting approximately \$4 million to replace corrugated metal pipes and other drainage projects. While not limited to western Chula Vista, this is a welcomed investment.

**Recommendation:** That Council approves the funding request.

**Recommendation:** That the GMOC be provided a briefing on the criteria that will be used to prioritize which drainage projects receive funding, and that the GMOC is allowed the opportunity to comment on the criteria.

## 3.7 PARKS & RECREATION

**Threshold:** Three acres of neighborhood and community parkland with appropriate facilities shall be provided per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

#### CURRENT:

*In Compliance*

**Land:** Actual: 3.45 acres per 1,000 residents east of I-805

**Facilities:** Actual Facilities – Based on Parks Master Plan

#### FUTURE:

**LAND:** *Will Be Met*

**FACILITY:** *Threshold Likely Met*

---

**Discussion:** For several years the City has been attempting to complete a Parks Master Plan. That plan and associated financing program (RECDIF) was adopted late last year. This is a long awaited and welcomed event. Now, for the first time, the GMOC has an objective measure upon which to evaluate the adequacy of recreational facilities.

### 3.7.1 Facility Adequacy

**Issues:** **Facility Adequacy East of I-805**  
Evaluation of appropriate recreation facilities can now begin based upon the Parks Master Plan.

**Recommendation:** The GMOC requests that the City Manager direct staff to provide an annual progress report on facility development and staffing per the Parks Master Plan.

### 3.7.2 Equivalence of Recreational Opportunities

**Issue:** As reported last year, recreational opportunities in eastern Chula Vista compared to western Chula Vista are different. That difference is expected to continue. However, the GMOC believes that there can and should be a qualitative equivalence in respective park and recreation

experiences in east and west. With the approved Parks Master Plan, focus can now be applied to innovative approaches to creating a quality recreation experience for residents in western Chula Vista comparable to what is being developed in the east. According to the Parks Master Plan even when counting existing school lands, there is a deficit of approximately 100 acres of parkland citywide following the 3 acres per thousand standard. Since eastern Chula Vista exceeds the 3 acres per thousand standard, this deficit must fall in the west. While the GMOC is not specifically recommending the 3-acre of parkland per thousand population standard be applied to a “subarea” like the west, it is indicative in illustrating the disparity between east and west. The GMOC is particularly concerned with recreational opportunities in the southwestern part of the city. When the city annexed the southwest area in 1985 there was already a disparity between the recreational resources there and the “original” western part of the city.

**Recommendation:** That the City Council directs the City Manager to actively pursue innovative recreational funding opportunities for western Chula Vista. Grants from foundations, businesses, and state and federal government sources should be pursued.

**Recommendation:** In conjunction with this, the GMOC requests that the City Council direct the City Manager to assign appropriate city staff in the Departments of Recreation, Building and Parks Construction, or other department to propose an amended GMOC Threshold for Parks and Recreation, which includes western Chula Vista. As western Chula Vista is experiencing growth due to demographic change and further land use intensification is a possibility, this portion of the City should also be covered in a Park and Recreation threshold standard. A report on the status of this recommendation will be appreciated as a part of next year’s GMOC review.

### **3.7.3 Completion of Greenbelt Master Plan**

**Issue:** The City hired a staff person from the firm of Chapin Land Management in June 2001 to work in concert with City staff to complete the Greenbelt Master Plan. A draft version of the Master Plan is expected to be completed this spring and possibly adopted this summer. The plan is currently under public review.

The GMOC looks forward to the completion of the Greenbelt Master Plan.

### **3.7.4 Joint Use of City/School Recreation Facilities**

**Issue:** In the draft “Schools Task Force” report the joint use of school and city facilities to reach recreational objectives is recommended. This may



have particular relevance to western Chula Vista, which has a scarcity of available recreational land. The joint use of recreational land between the city and school districts is sound in principle, and it serves to maximize a community resource.

While the rewards of successful joint use makes the attempt worthwhile the record is mixed in terms of results. One of the key elements is to establish a long term master field allocation system to establish the equitable use of the playing fields among competing interests and secondly to design schools so that their fields, sports areas, libraries and parking are easily accessible to the public and can be used by the public after normal school hours.

**Recommendation:**

The City Council should consider the additional joint use of park and recreational resources with the school districts only after a careful analysis of the equitable use of these areas for the benefit of the general public.

## 3.8 POLICE

### Threshold:

*Emergency Response*<sup>1</sup>: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority I calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

*Urgent Response*<sup>2</sup>: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 57% of the Priority II, urgent calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority II calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.30 minutes) or less (measured annually).

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**CURRENT:**      *Not In Compliance*

However, it is noted that emergency response time improved from 79.7% in FY 00-01 to 80% in FY 01-02. Moreover, the 1% overage in Emergency Response time represents only 12 calls and is within statistical variation. *The GMOC considers this “virtual” compliance.*

**FUTURE:**      *Threshold Likely Met*

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response	81.0	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response	57.0	7 minutes	7:30 minutes
<b>Actual</b>			
Emergency Response	80.0%	7 minutes	min./sec.
Urgent Response	45.6%	7 minutes	min./sec.

---

1 Priority 1 - Emergency Calls. Life-threatening calls; felony in progress; probability of injury (crime or accident); robbery or panic alarms; urgent cover calls from officers. Response: Immediate response by two officers from any source or assignment, immediate response by paramedics/fire if injuries are believed to have occurred.

2 Priority 2 - Urgent Calls. Misdemeanor in progress; possibility of injury; serious non-routine calls (domestic violence or other disturbances with potential for violence); burglary alarms. Response: Immediate response by two officers from clear units or those on interruptible activities (traffic, field interviews, etc.)

**Discussion:**

Police response time is just one measure of how police services are keeping pace with growth. Measures to improve response time have been and continue to be implemented; these include such items as maintaining full staffing to technological improvements.

Response time is recognized as being less than an ideal threshold particularly when it is looked at in isolation. A community attitude survey concerning the quality of police service consistently shows the police receiving high marks. The community is satisfied yet the threshold has failed. The difficulty is defining a threshold measure that reflects some aspect of police service which is directly impacted by growth, and that some corrective action can be taken to correct a failure. Linking a threshold to a crime rate figure is flawed, as crime is often inversely related to growth. That is, in a strong economy accompanied by increased growth crime rates typically go down. The reverse occurs when the economy is weak. So, use of such a threshold measure could in the extreme lead to a strategy of promoting ever more growth to lower the crime rate. Two measures that do relate to the ability of the Police Department to maintain the quality of life and are growth related are maintaining adequate staffing and reducing false alarms.

### **3.8.1 Performance Targets**

**Issue:**

In the search to find additional appropriate measures through which to monitor the quality of police service in the face of growth, the GMOC will investigate establishing a set of “targets” to be monitored. Currently, these “targets” are outside of the parameters as established by the city’s Growth Management Ordinance. Monitoring these “targets” may lead to a specific recommendation by the GMOC for their formal inclusion as a threshold measure. This initial investigation period will evaluate the difficulty and cost of providing the information and if the target ultimately proves useful in assessing how the Police Department is responding to growth. The targets are:

1. Maintaining the advanced hire program and an effective number of officers relative to the population.
2. A decrease in the rate of false alarms, particularly in new developments.

**Recommendation:**

Beginning with the next year’s review cycle the GMOC will, working in conjunction with the Police Department, establish targets and monitor staffing and false alarms and how this is related to growth, and report on this to the City Council on or before next year’s joint workshop.

### **3.8.2 Removal of False Alarms from Response Times**

**Issue:**

98% of alarms are false. However, that 2% which are real requires continued vigilance and response. The GMOC believes that including

the response times when responding to false alarms dilutes the response time threshold.

**Recommendation:**

For GMOC purposes, response times for false alarms should not be included in the Police threshold calculation for emergency or urgent response when calculating the percent responded to within 7 minutes and the average response times.

### 3.8.3 Additional Measures to Reduce Response Time

**Issue:**

As the table below indicates, the Police Department has made progress in reducing their response time over the past several years. The Police Department is engaged in several current or proposed initiatives to continue the reduction in response times.

<b>HISTORIC RESPONSE TIMES</b> <b>PRIORITY I – Emergency Response, Calls For Service</b>			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
Threshold		81.0%	5:30
FY 2001-02	1,539 of 71,859	80.0%	5:07
FY 2000-01	1,734 of 73,977	79.7%	5:13
FY 1999-00	1,750 of 76,738	75.9%	5:21
CY 1999 <sup>1</sup>	1,890 of 74,405	70.9%	5:50

These initiatives include:

- ◆ **Dispatch staffed.** The Dispatch section is now fully staffed.
- ◆ **Additional police car in East during busy times** An additional car has been added to the eastern beat.
- ◆ **Greater area familiarity.** Team policing has been instituted.
- ◆ **Full Staffing.** Due to the implementation of the advance hire program staffing overall is at a record level with 223 positions filled out of 228 (as of 3/31/03).
- ◆ **Faster address location.** The Department has now upgraded so that the entire patrol fleet has Mobile Data Computers (MDCs) to allow for mapping capabilities. In-car mapping helps officers ascertain the quickest route to a

<sup>1</sup> The FY98-99 GMOC report used calendar 1999 data due to the implementation of the new CAD system in mid-1998.

call location. In addition, these maps can be more easily updated to include new streets in east Chula Vista.

- ◆ **Global positioning system.** The Department has purchased the GPS hardware for this system, and is currently preparing the software base needed to implement this technology. This technology will integrate GPS in cars with the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system, which will allow police dispatchers to route the nearest available units to calls for service.
- ◆ **Continuing efforts under the Advance Hire program.** Under this initiative, the Department is able to hire five officers over the number authorized. This program takes into account anticipated officer turnover and the lengthy lead-time required to place new officers on the street. This initiative helps ensure that adequate numbers of officers will be available for patrol duties, which in turn, favorably affects response times. It is anticipated being in an overhire situation in January 2003, with the beginning of the 55th Regional Academy

**Recommendation:**

That the Police Department remain diligent in meeting and achieving shorter response times than what is indicated as the Threshold Standard through the active pursuit and implementation of their current and planned programs and report on how these measures improved response times to next years GMOC.

Specifically:

- ◆ The GMOC continues to support plans to conduct a dispatch staffing study, including the Dispatch Manager Concept<sup>1</sup>. This study will aid in identifying ways of reducing response time for priority calls for service.
- ◆ The GMOC supports continued use of the patrol staffing model and the advance hiring program. Both enhance the department's ability to respond to calls for service, maintain a 1:1 ratio of officer time spent responding to calls for service: officer-initiated activities, and a zero vacancy factor in patrol.
- ◆ The GMOC continues to support planned upgrades of police technologies, such as MDCs, in-car mapping and global positioning systems. It is imperative that the Department continues to build a solid technology infrastructure in order to service a growing community.
- ◆ The GMOC continues to support research and evaluation of call management options, and alternative response and deployment tactics, such as Internet reporting, revised beat configurations, and

---

<sup>1</sup> The dispatch manager would be responsible for supervising all communications operators; scheduling and assignments; training of staff; and implementing policies. Currently the lead communications operators (LCO) serve as working communications operators as well as supervisors. A dispatch manager would increase efficiency of the dispatch function by allowing the LCOs to spend more time handling calls.

evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of an aerial platform. Research staff should be looking at several of these issues over the next 18 to 24 months, as a means of maximizing both the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department, and report progress to the GMOC.

### 3.8.4 False Alarms

**Issue:** As indicated in the tables below, the number of false alarms within the community has declined during the current reporting period.

<b>NUMBER OF FALSE ALARMS FY 1997-98 THROUGH FY 2001-02</b>				
<b>FY 1997-98</b>	<b>FY 1998-99</b>	<b>FY 1999-00</b>	<b>FY 2000-01</b>	<b>FY 2001-02</b>
6,073	6,287	6,690	7,207	6,918
% Change	3.5%	6.4%	5.0%	-4.0%
Includes Calls Cancelled en-Route	N/A	N/A	8,238	8,013
% Change				-2.7%

#### **Calendar Year Totals for False Alarms Per System Per Year**

(Available only for calendar year, but fiscal year totals should be similar)

	1999	2000	2001 (Annualized)	2002 (Annualized)
Commercial	2.13	1.93	1.44	1.56
Includes Calls Cancelled en-Route				1.58
Residential	0.90	0.71	0.52	0.48
Includes Calls Cancelled en-Route				0.57
Total (Comm. & Res.)	1.33	1.12	0.79	.77
Includes Calls Cancelled en-Route				0.84

The false alarm analyst position was vacant from September 2001 through June 2002. However, an alarm analyst was hired in August 2002,

and that person has undertaken a number of projects designed to reduce false alarms, as follows:

- **Alarm Company Subscriber List Exchange.** Under this initiative, the alarm companies forward their lists of subscribers to the alarm analyst, who cross-references the company lists with city lists. Cross-referencing the two lists enables the analyst to identify alarm users without permits, increase the accuracy of the company lists, and collect additional information regarding monitoring company contacts for specific alarm users, should their alarms be set off. There have been two such list exchanges to date and several more are planned.
- **Alarm Company Meetings.** During the first quarter of 2003, the alarm analyst will hold individual meetings with the 5 alarm companies with the highest false alarm rates. During the meetings, the companies will receive information packets that contain a description of the Chula Vista Alarms Program; registration materials for both alarm agents (installers) and alarm companies; updated alarm user applications; City of Chula Vista municipal ordinance information; registered alarm users for that company in the City's False Alarm Analysis Program (FAAP) database; and information on false alarm rate rankings for that company as compared to others.
- **Billing from FAAP.** The Alarms Program is on the verge of using the FAAP database as the sole source for billing accounts and tracking alarm user account information. Using only the FAAP will cut alarm data entry by 50%, freeing up additional time for the analyst to work proactively to reduce false alarms.
- **Weekly Calls.** Every Monday and Tuesday telephone calls are made to locations that have had 2 false alarms during the prior week, as well as those that have had 3, 6 or more for the year. The goal of calling these locations is to reduce false alarms by informing the alarm user of the severity of the situation. The alarm user is asked have his or her system inspected and to re-train those that have access to the system. A total of 136 calls to repeat false alarm locations have been documented since the log was created in September 2002.
- **Business License Checks on Alarm Companies.** In early September 2002, the Alarms Program supplied the City of Chula Vista Business License Office with the names and addresses of alarm companies that operate within the city. The Business License Office plans to cross-reference the list with their licensing database to ensure that all alarm businesses are legally licensed to operate in the city.

- **Alarm Company Registration Requirements.** With the help of the Special Investigations Unit in October 2002, it was determined that both alarm companies and alarm agents (installers) must register with the Police Department per City of Chula Vista Ordinance chapter 9.06. Registration of alarm companies will help the analyst obtain accurate contact information for these businesses. In addition, alarm agent registration will enable the analyst to develop a database of installers who operate within the city limits, and also compare installation quality across installers. Installation standards could subsequently be set, based on data obtained from the registration database.
- **Ordinance Research.** Research continues on necessary revisions to the existing city ordinance that governs alarm systems, alarm users, and alarm companies. Several model ordinances have been identified. The revised Chula Vista ordinance will address a number of issues, including alarm company and alarm agent registration compliance and installation standards.

**Recommendation:**

That the City Council continues to support the Police Department's actions to reduce false alarms.



### 3.9 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

**Threshold:** Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

#### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**CURRENT:** *Not in Compliance*

**FUTURE:** *Potential for Future Non-Compliance*

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time
Emergency Response	80.0	7 minutes
<b>Actual</b>		
Emergency Response	69.7	7 minutes

---

#### Discussion

A surprise decline in the percent of calls responded to within 7 minutes has occurred. In the last reporting period 80.8% of calls were responded to within 7 minutes, while in the most recent term, only 69.7% had responses within 7 minutes. This was unexpected as it was anticipated that changing to a new dispatch provider would improve response time. However, increases in dispatch, turn out, and travel time have been experienced. Both east and west Chula Vista have been impacted, although the degree of impact was considerably less in the west.

<b>FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times Since 1994</b>		
Years	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes
FY 2001-02	7,626	69.7%
FY 2000-01	7,128	80.8%
FY 1999-00	6,654	79.7%
CY 1999	6,344	77.2%
CY 1998	4,119	81.9%
CY 1997	6,275	82.4%
CY 1996	6,103	79.4%
CY 1995	5,885	80.0%
CY 1994	5,701	81.7%

There are no easy answers to explain the decline in performance. There have been regulatory and procedural changes that result in longer response times. And, there has been continued growth in the east. It was reported that 79.4% of calls in the west are responded to within 7 minutes compared to 43.7% of the calls in the east. Fire Station 7 will be operational in September 2003, and will assist in improving response times. Station 7 will ultimately have a staff of 21 with 9 staff upon opening. In addition, Fire Station No. 6 is planned for Rolling Hills Ranch, to be relocated from the temporary location in the Eastlake Business Park. The process to relocate the station will be completed 1 year after Fire Station 7 is completed. The station has a staff of 3 per shift for a total of 9.

**However, the GMOC must conclude that fire station construction, staffing, and acquiring equipment is lagging behind growth relative to maintaining the GMOC threshold.**

As indicated the disparity in response time from eastern and western portions of the city is in large part a function of the relative number and proximity of fire stations to residences and businesses. A complicating factor may be community design. Fire Department staff has indicated a concern that relative to the western portion of the city, the new master planned areas are characterized by long circuitous streets, some guarded/gated communities, and in some rare cases speed bumps on sections of private road. All of these features are believed to retard response times. While the impact of community design on the response time of an individual trip can be speculated, the relative value of this over the greater than 7,500 total priority trips taken in a reporting period is not known. In other words, the exact magnitude of design features on overall response time averages has not been quantified. Therefore, the significance of “design” in the decline in response times remains uncertain. In any event, the future physical layout of eastern development is now being adjusted to more closely resemble a grid pattern, which may improve response time performance.

The GMOC believes that the response time standard must be applied equally to both east and west. The Fire Department is tasked with providing this level of service in an equitable fashion.

### **3.9.1 Maintaining Threshold**

**Issue:** There are three fundamental issues, (1) the correct fire station configuration given Chula Vista’s current and future population and physical layout, (2) continued explicit and formal Fire Department input into community design considerations, and (3) improved management information systems in regards to monitoring response times .

**Recommendation:** The Fire Department has indicated the need to update their master plan to better plan for current and future development. This is fully endorsed by

the GMOC. A presentation on the findings of the updated master plan is requested during next year's GMOC review cycle.

**Recommendation:** Comments have been made by the Fire Department regarding the impact of community design on response time. The GMOC recommends that the Fire Department ~~will~~ continue to make formal and written comments to development review bodies on the impact of community design on response time. A report on such activity will be requested in next year's questionnaire so that the GMOC is better acquainted with the relevant issues being discussed.

**Recommendation:** The GMOC believes that with call for service response time feedback on a daily basis broken out by individual trip and station the Fire Department will be better able to diagnose the situation and perhaps identify procedural/operational changes that could improve response times. As such, the GMOC is recommending that the Fire Department work with Heartland Dispatch to set up the methodology and implement a daily reporting regime so that response times can be monitored and analyzed in house.

### **3.9.2 Monitoring Targets**

**Issue:** Similar to the Police threshold, response time alone is not a complete measure by which to rate the Fire/EMS Department's response to growth. Other measures should be considered. A set of "targets" has been identified that represent benchmarks in how resources are being allocated to the fire Department in order for them to maintain the threshold. Monitoring these "targets" may lead to a specific recommendation by the GMOC for their formal inclusion as a threshold measure. This initial investigation period will evaluate the difficulty and cost of providing the information and if the target ultimately proves useful in assessing how the City is responding to growth.

**Recommendation:** That, the Fire Department, develops targets (i.e. schedules) for the following inputs, to be monitored by the GMOC through future questionnaires:

- (1) timing of Fire Station construction,
- (2) equipment purchase for these stations, and
- (3) staff hire relative to growth.

## 3.10 TRAFFIC

<b>Threshold:</b>	<i>City-wide:</i> Maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS “D” can occur for no more than two hours of the day.  <i>West of I-805:</i> Those signalized intersections that do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current 1991 LOS, but shall not worsen.
-------------------	--

### THRESHOLD FINDING:

**CURRENT**  
*In Compliance*

**FUTURE**  
*Potential For Non-Compliance*

---

#### 3.10.1 Timely Construction of SR-125

<b>Issues:</b>	The timely construction of SR-125 is critical for the City to maintain the quality of life standards for traffic. Currently, the projected completion of SR-125 is expected in October of 2006. A possible early opening of the northbound link may come as early as November or December of 2005.
<b>Recommendation:</b>	That City Council continues to support the timely construction of SR-125 to avoid a potential traffic threshold failure in eastern Chula Vista.

#### 3.10.2 Traffic Enhancement Opportunities

<b>Issues:</b>	Based upon traffic model analysis conducted through the City’s Engineering Department, Telegraph Canyon Road east of I-805 and East H Street could experience a GMOC traffic threshold failure prior to the completion of SR-125. This possibility requires the GMOC to state that there is the “ <b>Potential for Non-Compliance</b> ”.  To address this situation Olympic Parkway completion was accelerated, and the City working in concert with the development community is implementing several additional traffic capacity enhancement initiatives.
----------------	---

These efforts are intended to avert a traffic threshold failure by increasing road capacity and decreasing demand. These initiatives include:

- East H Street north bound I-805 on-ramp improvements to be completed July 2003 (south-bound improvements completed in March 2003);
- On-ramp improvements at the Telegraph Canyon Road I-805 interchange, completion date November 2003;
- Improvement of the Olympic Parkway I-805 interchange completed by May 2005;
- Promoting Transportation Demand Management Techniques (TDM).

The road capacity enhancement initiatives will add additional capacity to the city's roadways, and therefore allow additional housing that can be constructed without a threshold failure.

The action taken by Council on April 15, 2003 that established a three-year building permit "Monitoring" program should provide the restraint necessary to avoid a traffic threshold failure during that period. In the event of a growth management traffic threshold failure, prior to the completion of the three-year monitoring program, the provisions in the growth management ordinance will prevail.

**Recommendation:**

The GMOC compliments the City Council, City staff, and the major developers, for engaging in a collaborative and proactive program to avoid a potential traffic threshold failure. As stated last year, the GMOC expects that the City Council will continue to support and take action to protect the integrity of the Traffic Threshold. Specifically, the GMOC endorses the action of the City to address and avoid a threshold failure namely:

- Traffic enhancement projects.
- Implementing appropriate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs.
- Continues ongoing Traffic Monitoring (TMP) of strategic road segments

### **3.10.3 Traffic Monitoring Program Reporting**

**Issue:**

The Traffic Engineering Division of the Engineering Department conducts regular traffic runs through the traffic monitoring program (TMP), to measure road segment performance relative to the growth management threshold standard. These reports are then presented to the GMOC as part of the annual reporting process. The traditional reporting process has the GMOC receive the report conducted in the spring of the previous fiscal year. Traffic runs are often conducted at a later date that

may show either improvement or further decline relative to the traffic threshold, but these reports are not routinely provided to the GMOC.

**Recommendation:**

In an effort to be current, all TMP runs should be reported to the GMOC immediately after they are conducted and tabulated. A short report indicating the findings of the TMP relative to the traffic threshold should be prepared and transmitted to the GMOC.

### **3.10.4 Traffic Thresholds and Measurement**

**Issue:**

As indicated earlier, based upon the findings of the traffic monitoring program (TMP), all city streets are in compliance with the growth management traffic quality of life indicator. In fact, the traffic situation has improved on Telegraph Canyon Road since the full opening of Olympic Parkway.

The traffic threshold and the traffic monitoring program are complex undertakings. It has become apparent through the GMOC public outreach events that a better understanding of both the way the traffic threshold is defined and how it is monitored needs to be presented to the community. There also needs to be a discussion of alternative means of defining a traffic related threshold.

**Recommendation:**

That the City Council direct the City Manager to allocate sufficient resources for a public workshop on traffic thresholds and monitoring, to be held under the auspices of the GMOC. The purpose of the workshop is for the City's technical staff to present the traffic threshold and traffic monitoring program, identify possible alternatives, and to respond to questions from the public. And in preparation for this workshop that staff review and evaluate the existing traffic thresholds and traffic monitoring process, identify possible alternatives, and bring back specific recommendations for GMOC and then possible Council Action after the workshop. This workshop to be conducted at the request of the GMOC during next year's review cycle and be held in a venue convenient to the community.

### **3.11.5 Highway Traffic and Quality of Life**

**Issue:**

The current traffic threshold applies to city streets and excludes highways/freeways. Highways/freeways were excluded because they are not under City control and there is no direct means to influence improvements that could alleviate a freeway threshold failure. Members of the community have questioned the value of a quality of life threshold that clears city streets only for the commuter to be stopped or slowed by freeway traffic. It has also been pointed out that there are other thresholds where the City does not have direct influence such as schools and air quality. And, while there is no direct control the question has

been asked, doesn't allowing continued growth that places traffic on area freeways contribute to that congestion?

**Recommendation:**

In order to better assess this situation, the GMOC requests that the City Council direct the City Manager to investigate the relationship of continued city growth to highway/freeway congestion, and to report the findings to the GMOC by January of 2004.

### **3.11.6 Transit Threshold**

**Issue:**

As congestion increases and the region continues to urbanize questions have arisen about creating a "traffic" related threshold standard for the level of transit services. The GMOC believes that further investigation is warranted.

**Recommendation:**

That the Council direct the City Manager to assign appropriate staff to investigate the form and appropriateness of a transit quality of life standard that could be incorporated into the growth management program, and report on their findings to the GMOC by January 2004.

### 3.11 SCHOOLS

**Threshold:** The City of Chula Vista shall annually provide the two local School Districts with a 12-18 month forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecasted and continuing growth. The Districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed.
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities.
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities.
4. Other relevant information the Districts desire to communicate to the City and GMOC.

#### **THRESHOLD FINDING:**

**CURRENT:** Capacity used now or committed.

**CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*In Compliance*

**SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*In Compliance*

**FORECAST:** Ability to absorb forecasted growth - Funding and site availability for projected new facilities.

**CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Statement of Concern*

**SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT -**  
*Statement of Concern*

---

**Discussion:** Schools are arguably one of the most important services that a community offers to its residents. Growth has an obvious impact on



schools as the addition of students creates a commensurate need for additional facilities.

**The role of the GMOC is to assure that the City's planning program provides for the timely designation and land use entitlements for new school sites and that roads and utilities are provided so that construction can commence, and once completed, that the facility can operate.**

The City and the GMOC has no direct role in determining when a school is actually constructed. Construction is the responsibility of the respective school districts. In like fashion, issues regarding class size, the quality of education, test scores, and the maintenance and upgrading of facilities are beyond the City's and the GMOC's scope. In addition, with the passage of SB50, the City is prohibited from restricting or limiting growth due to impacts on schools.

Never the less, the GMOC views itself as a forum for the expression of community sentiments, and will alert the City Council and Planning Commission on larger school development issues as it deems is relevant and important.

### **3.11.1 Monitoring Growth**

**Issue:**

Both the Chula Vista Elementary (CVESD) and Sweetwater Union High School Districts (SUHSD) were judged to be technically in compliance with the threshold standard.

The GMOC recognizes and appreciates the effort of the school districts to keep abreast of growth. The CVESD has a history of building schools on a parallel track with development. The SUHSD has recently completed San Ysidro High School, and both Otay Ranch High School and EastLake Middle School completions are expected by July 2003.

These efforts will help to assure that school capacity at the elementary, middle and high school level will be maintained.

**The GMOC recognizes that even though the threshold standard is being met, the strains of growth are being felt. As school design capacity is exceeded students are either bussed outside their schools service area or new "relocatable" classrooms are constructed on existing school campuses. And, as the number of these relocatable classrooms increases, outdoor activity space decreases and there is not the commensurate increase in facilities such as restrooms. This is particularly evident at the older west side high schools. These facilities are showing the signs of age and inadequate fiscal resources for some basic maintenance. While not within the GMOC purview, it appears that there is no obvious or comprehensive program to address these deficiencies. This is a concern to the GMOC and the community.**

**Recommendation:** That the school districts continue with their proactive efforts in identifying funding and building new schools before the need is at an even greater critical stage.

### 3.11.2 School Construction – Elementary Schools

**Issue:** Overall, sites and funding for additional elementary schools have kept pace with growth. In order to leverage state funds for construction and avoiding full cost recovery from new homeowners, which keeps housing costs more affordable, the CVESD may be limited to building only one school per year. A school for San Miguel Ranch is set for next year, followed by Eastlake Woods, and then Otay Ranch Village 6, and Village 11.

As a result a school for Otay Ranch Village 6 may not be available until the 2006/07 school year. Based on the recently approved “Monitoring” program there may already be 3,500 units permitted between Otay Ranch Villages 6 and 11 by this time with most of those units occupied. Mass bussing will take place for up to 3 years to take elementary school aged students to the Hedenkamp Elementary School in Sunbow.

The GMOC recognizes that the CVESD is employing a fair and equitable construction sequencing program and are utilizing their financial resources prudently. The outcome that extensive bussing will be necessitated because schools will not be built in a timely fashion at appropriate sites is because of state funding constraints beyond the control of the CVESD. The situation never the less must be recognized by the GMOC as community impact and warrants a GMOC “**Statement of Concern**”.

A GMOC “**Statement of Concern**” is issued in response to this situation so that the Council and the community are made aware of the problem. This “Statement” requires the City Council to consider the adoption of a resolution reflecting that concern during the public hearing on the GMOC’s report (aka Joint Workshop), to be directed to the school districts with follow-up to assure appropriate response by that agency. In this situation, however, the GMOC believes that the CVESD and the City are responding to the concern in the appropriate manner and therefore a resolution is not required. Moreover, the CVESD is proceeding at a pace dictated by the state’s release of funding for new school construction.

**Recommendation:** It is acknowledged that the City has no direct control over school facility construction, and that regulating growth due to school impacts is prohibited by SB50.

However, it is recommended that the Council direct the City Manager to coordinate City resources as appropriate and join with the CVESD in

their on-going efforts to build a new elementary school in Otay Ranch Village 6 at the earliest time possible.

**Recommendation:** That the CVESD endeavor to find creative financing to build three elementary schools in the next 2 years, one each at San Miguel Ranch, EastLake Woods, and Otay Ranch Village 6.

### 3.11.3 School Construction - Middle and High Schools

**Issue:** A new middle school will be opened this August. The need for an additional middle school is not anticipated for the next 3 years.

Based on the most recent forecast as provided by the SUHSD, it is estimated that high school number 13 will be required by mid-2006. The SUHSD, the City of Chula Vista, and the development community are working in close coordination to meet this timeframe. Currently a new high school site is being identified, funding is anticipated to be available, and plans used for the Otay Ranch High School can be reused so as to fast track the approval process. Site selection will be contingent upon the ability to provide infrastructure to the location in a timely fashion so that construction can begin on schedule.

A 3 to 3.5 year process, while achievable, is acknowledged to be ambitious with no room for delay. While the GMOC recognizes that focused effort is being undertaken to bring the high school on-line in a timely fashion, delays are not uncommon. Given this situation the GMOC will issue a **“Statement of Concern”**. In all likelihood if the process takes longer existing high school sites will be called upon to absorb additional growth through bussing, larger class sizes and the placement of relocatable classrooms. While solving the immediate problem, such an outcome is not desirable.

The GMOC recognizes that the SUHSD is pursuing the new high school with all due diligence, however the GMOC would be remiss if it did not recognize this situation and determine that a potentially serious problem exists with respect to school capacity if the schedule is not met. This warrants a formal **“Statement of Concern”**. This “Statement” requires the City Council to consider the adoption of a resolution reflecting that concern during the public hearing on the GMOC’s report (aka Joint Workshop), to be directed to the school districts with follow-up to assure appropriate response by that agency. In this situation, however, the GMOC believes that the SUHSD the City, and the development community are responding to the concern in the appropriate manner and therefore a resolution is not required.

**Recommendation:** Assuming that there is no change in the expected number of students as forecasted by the SUHSD, facilitating high school construction should be

placed as the City Manager's highest priority when working with the SUHSD and developers to finalize site selection and to assure road and utility access to the site in a timely fashion. This will constitute the City's primary contribution to maintain the school threshold.

#### **3.11.4      The Schools Task Force**

**Issue:** A Schools Task Force was created in July of 2002 to address issues regarding school crowding, school planning, construction, financing, and the joint use of recreational areas. The task force was comprised of 15 members, 5 appointed by the City, and 5 each from the two school districts. Former Councilperson John Moot was appointed as the Chair. The task force had a series of 8 meetings and one field trip taken jointly with the GMOC. At this writing a set of recommendations are in draft form. There are several recommendations that concern the City's growth management program and the GMOC.

**Recommendation:** The GMOC will consider the recommendations of the Schools Task Force and report to Council on or before next year's joint GMOC, City Council, Planning Commission workshop with a response.

## **4.0 APPENDICES**

- 4.1 Appendix A – Recommendations and Implementing Actions**
- 4.2 Appendix B - Workshop Reports (Included in Volume II)**
- 4.3 Appendix C – Growth Forecast (Included in Volume II)**
- 4.4 Appendix D – Threshold Questionnaires and Supplemental Data (Included in Volume II)**

**APPENDIX A**  
**2002 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY**

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
<p><b><u>General</u></b></p> <p>That the City Council directs the City Manager to provide sufficient staff and supporting resources to facilitate a thorough review of the growth management program and that the GMOC is a vital part of the review process.</p>	<p>Staff accepts recommendation.</p>
<p><b>1. <u>Fiscal</u></b></p> <p>No issues</p>	<p><b>1. <u>Fiscal</u></b></p> <p>Response not required</p>
<p><b>2. <u>Air Quality</u></b></p> <p><b>2.1</b> The GMOC continues to endorse the development of updated guidelines for the AQIP. Any proposed change to the Growth Management Ordinance should be brought before the GMOC for comment.</p>	<p><b>2. <u>Air Quality</u></b></p> <p>City staff accepts recommendation.</p>
<p><b>3. <u>Sewer</u></b></p> <p>No issues.</p>	<p><b>3. <u>Sewer</u></b></p> <p>Response not required</p>
<p><b>4. <u>Water</u></b></p> <p><b>4.1</b> That the City works in cooperation with the Sweetwater Authority in identifying strategic water distribution improvements and funding mechanisms.</p>	<p><b>4. <u>Water</u></b></p> <p>The Sweetwater Authority accepts the recommendation and will continue to work with the City to identify strategic water distribution improvements and appropriate funding mechanisms.</p>

**APPENDIX A**  
**2002 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY**

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
<p><b>5.     <u>Libraries</u></b></p> <p><b>5.1</b> That the City continue to actively pursue the Rancho Del Rey Library Planning/Building Plan Program and place as a priority the identification of adequate construction funding by the target completion date of 2005 or 2006 at the latest.</p>	<p><b>5.     <u>Libraries</u></b></p> <p>In June 2002, the City submitted an application for cycle-one funding under the "California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 2000" to construct a 36,300 square foot library at East H and Paseo Ranchero. Unfortunately, competition for round-one funding was fierce. The state received 61 applications and ultimately funded 18 projects for a total of \$140 million. Although the Chula Vista application received a "very good" overall rating and an "excellent" rating on two of the four evaluation categories, the Rancho del Rey Library was not one of the funded projects. As a result, staff revised the application package in order to become more competitive and resubmitted the application in March 2003 for cycle-two consideration. The total cost of this new branch is projected to be \$22,528,800 with \$10,840,600 coming from the grant and the remainder from Development Impact Fees (DIF). It is expected that the Library Bond Board will make the cycle-two award decisions in September. The State received 67 applications in this round and will only be able to award \$110 million in grants. Should Chula Vista be unsuccessful in round-two, the City does intend to re-apply for cycle-three consideration. Those applications will be due in January 2004. Even if the project receives no State Library grant funding, the Rancho del Rey Library is 100% DIF eligible and project will move forward following the completion of the grant application process.</p>
<p><b>6.     <u>Drainage</u></b></p> <p><b>6.1</b> That Council approves the funding request for approximately \$4 million to replace corrugated metal pipes and other drainage projects. While not limited to western Chula Vista, this is a welcomed investment.</p>	<p><b>6.     <u>Drainage</u></b></p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

**APPENDIX A**  
**2002 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY**

<b>GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>STAFF RESPONSES &amp; PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS</b>
<p><b>6.2</b> That the GMOC be provided a briefing on the criteria that will be used to prioritize which drainage projects receive funding, and that the GMOC is allowed the opportunity to comment on the criteria.</p>	<p>Staff will schedule a workshop meeting to discuss drainage project selection criteria at the GMOC's convenience.</p>
<p><b>7.     <u>Parks and Recreation</u></b></p> <p><b>7.1</b> The GMOC requests that the City Manager direct staff to provide an annual progress report on facility development and staffing per the Parks Master Plan.</p> <p><b>7.2</b> That the City Council directs the City Manager to actively pursue innovative recreational funding opportunities for western Chula Vista. Grants from foundations, businesses, and state and federal government sources should be pursued.</p> <p><b>7.3</b> The GMOC requests that the City Council direct the City Manager to assign appropriate city staff in the Departments of Recreation, Building and Parks Construction, or other department to propose an amended GMOC Threshold for Parks and Recreation, which includes western Chula Vista. As western Chula Vista is experiencing growth due to demographic change and further land use intensification is a possibility, this portion of the City should also be covered in a Park and Recreation threshold standard. A report on the status of this recommendation will be appreciated as a part of next year's GMOC review.</p>	<p><b>7.     <u>Parks and Recreation</u></b></p> <p>The Recreation Department will be happy to provide an annual progress report to the GMOC, working in conjunction with the Building and Park Construction Department.</p> <p>Building and Park Construction staff is proposing an innovative financing plan for capital improvements in Western Chula Vista, which Council will be considering in June 2003. The proposal includes funding of improvements to Eucalyptus Park, Otay Park, a newly acquired site for a park on Oxford Street, and the Chula Vista Woman's Club building. The Recreation Department will be pursuing State grant funds as they become available. In addition, the Recreation Department is reforming a non-profit Friends of Parks and Recreation, and plans to seek foundation funding and other granting opportunities for citywide recreation services.</p> <p>Staff from the Recreation, Building and Park Construction, Planning, Community Development, and Finance Departments, and City Manager's office are currently looking at parks and recreation needs for Western Chula Vista, including a needs analysis, financing mechanism, and park development standard. Based on the analysis of this information the development of an appropriate park standard for western Chula Vista is anticipated. A report on the progress of this effort will be presented to GMOC during their review next year.</p>



**APPENDIX A**  
**2002 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY**

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
<p><b>7.4</b> The City Council should consider the additional joint use of park and recreational resources with the school districts only after a careful analysis of the equitable use of these areas for the benefit of the general public.</p>	<p>The Recreation Department is currently seeking a more equitable resource sharing relationship with the school districts for existing facilities and supports, and concurs with, the GMOC's recommendation for future joint uses.</p>
<p><b>8.     <u>Police</u></b></p> <p><b>8.1</b> Beginning with the next year's review cycle the GMOC will, working in conjunction with the Police Department, establish targets and monitor staffing and false alarms and how this is related to growth, and report on this to the City Council on or before next year's joint workshop.</p> <p><b>8.2</b> For GMOC purposes, response times for false alarms should not be included in the Police threshold calculation for emergency or urgent response when calculating the percent responded to within 7 minutes and the average response times.</p> <p><b>8.3</b> That the Police Department remain diligent in meeting and achieving shorter response times than what is indicated as the Threshold Standard through the active pursuit and implementation of their current and planned programs and report on how these measures improved response times to next years GMOC.</p>	<p><b>8.     <u>Police</u></b></p> <p>The Police Department will work with the GMOC to assess the practicality of establishing targets for monitoring staffing and false alarms.</p> <p>Beginning in FY02-03, the Police Department will not include response times for false burglar alarms in the threshold calculation for urgent response times when calculating the percent responded to within 7 minutes and the average response times. The Department recommends retaining in the emergency response time calculations false robbery alarms, as these incidents comprise less than 4% of all alarm calls and the potential for violence during these incidents is elevated.</p> <p>The Police Department will strive to meet or exceed GMOC thresholds. Progress on planned programs and self-assessment findings will be reported annually to the GMOC. The Police Department appreciates the GMOC's support for the dispatch staffing study; patrol staffing model; advance hire program; upgrades of police technologies such as MDCs, in-car mapping and global positioning systems; and, further evaluation of call management options such as Internet reporting. The dispatch study has been completed, and the</p>

**APPENDIX A**  
**2002 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY**

<b>GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>STAFF RESPONSES &amp; PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS</b>
<p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ The GMOC continues to support plans to conduct a dispatch staffing study, including the Dispatch Manager Concept. This study will aid in identifying ways of reducing response time for priority calls for service.</li> <li>◆ The GMOC supports continued use of the patrol staffing model and the advance hiring program. Both enhance the department's ability to respond to calls for service, maintain a 1:1 ratio of officer time spent responding to calls for service: officer-initiated activities, and a zero vacancy factor in patrol.</li> <li>◆ The GMOC continues to support planned upgrades of police technologies, such as MDCs, in-car mapping and global positioning systems. It is imperative that the Department continues to build a solid technology infrastructure in order to service a growing community.</li> <li>◆ The GMOC continues to support research and evaluation of call management options, and alternative response and deployment tactics, such as Internet reporting, revised beat configurations, and evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of an aerial platform. Research staff should be looking at several of these issues over the next 18 to 24 months, as a means of maximizing both the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department, and report progress to the GMOC.</li> </ul> <p><b>8.4</b> That the City Council continues to support the Police Department's actions to reduce false alarms.</p>	<p>Department will report on the findings in the next GMOC questionnaire. To the extent possible, the Department will strive to maintain a zero vacancy factor in patrol, given recent and forthcoming budget cuts.</p>           <p>The Police Department appreciates the GMOC's support for the Department's actions to reduce false alarms.</p>

**APPENDIX A**  
**2002 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY**

<b>GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>STAFF RESPONSES &amp; PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS</b>
<p><b>9. <u>Fire / Emergency Medical Services</u></b></p> <p><b>9.1</b> The Fire Department has indicated the need to update their master plan to better plan for current and future development. This is fully endorsed by the GMOC. A presentation on the findings of the updated master plan is requested during next year's GMOC review cycle.</p> <p><b>9.2</b> Comments have been made by the Fire Department regarding the impact of community design on response time. The GMOC recommends that the Fire Department continue to make formal and written comments to development review bodies on the impact of community design on response time. A report on such activity will be requested in next year's questionnaire so that the GMOC is better acquainted with the relevant issues being discussed.</p> <p><b>9.3</b> The GMOC believes that with call for service response time feedback on a daily basis broken out by individual trip and station the Fire Department will be better able to diagnose the situation and perhaps identify procedural/operational changes that could improve response times. As such, the GMOC is recommending that the Fire Department work with Heartland Dispatch to set up the methodology and implement a daily reporting regime so that response times can be monitored and analyzed in house.</p> <p><b>9.4</b> That, the Fire Department, develops targets (i.e. schedules) for the following inputs, to be monitored by the GMOC through future questionnaires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Timing of Fire Station construction,</li> <li>▪ Equipment purchase for these stations, and</li> <li>▪ Staff hire relative to growth.</li> </ul>	<p><b>9. <u>Fire / Emergency Medical Services</u></b></p> <p>The Fire Department will include a master plan presentation during next year's reporting cycle.</p> <p>The Fire Department acknowledges the GMOC recommendation</p> <p>The Fire Department will work with Heartland communications to improve response time reporting capabilities as well as develop a daily report of response time activity to enhance monitoring capabilities of the department.</p> <p>The department concurs with the GMOC recommendation. Targets will be developed and presented to the GMOC during the next reporting cycle.</p>

**APPENDIX A**  
**2002 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY**

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
<p><b>10. <u>Traffic</u></b></p> <p><b>10.1</b> That City Council continues to support the timely construction of SR-125 to avoid a potential traffic threshold failure in eastern Chula Vista.</p> <p><b>10.2.</b> The GMOC compliments the City Council, City staff, and the major developers, for engaging in a collaborative and proactive program to avoid a potential traffic threshold failure. As stated last year, the GMOC expects that the City Council will continue to support and take action to protect the integrity of the Traffic Threshold. Specifically, the GMOC endorses the action of the City to address and avoid a threshold failure namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪Traffic enhancement projects.</li> <li>▪Implementing appropriate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs.</li> <li>▪Continues ongoing Traffic Monitoring (TMP) of strategic road segments</li> </ul> <p><b>10.3.</b> In an effort to be current, all TMP runs should be reported to the GMOC immediately after they are conducted and tabulated. A short report indicating the findings of the TMP relative to the traffic threshold should be prepared and transmitted to the GMOC.</p> <p><b>10.4.</b> That the City Council directs the City Manager to allocate sufficient resources for a public workshop on traffic thresholds and monitoring, to be held under the auspices of the GMOC. The purpose of the workshop is for the City's technical staff to present the traffic threshold and traffic monitoring program, identify possible alternatives, and to respond to questions from the public. And in preparation for this workshop that staff review and evaluate the existing traffic thresholds and traffic monitoring process, identify possible alternatives, and bring back specific recommendations for GMOC and then possible Council Action after the workshop. This workshop to be conducted</p>	<p><b>10. <u>Traffic</u></b></p> <p>Staff agrees with the recommendation.</p> <p>Recommendation acknowledged.</p> <p>Recommendation is accepted; all future TMP runs will be reported to the GMOC as requested.</p> <p>Recommendation is accepted. Staff will coordinate efforts with the GMOC to prepare the necessary research and participate in workshop, and formulate recommendations for GMOC consideration.</p>

**APPENDIX A**  
**2002 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY**

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
<p>at the request of the GMOC during next year's review cycle and be held in a venue convenient to the community.</p> <p><b>10.5</b> The GMOC requests that the City Council directs the City Manager to investigate the relationship of continued city growth to highway/freeway congestion, and to report the findings to the GMOC by January of 2004.</p> <p><b>10.6</b> That the Council direct the City Manager to assign appropriate staff to investigate the form and appropriateness of a transit quality of life standard that could be incorporated into the growth management program, and report on their findings to the GMOC by January 2004.</p>	<p>Recommendation is accepted; staff will coordinate their research efforts with the GMOC and report as requested.</p> <p>Recommendation is accepted; staff will coordinate their research efforts with the GMOC and report as requested.</p>
<p><b>11. <u>Schools</u></b></p> <p><b>11.1</b> That the school districts continue with their proactive efforts in identifying funding and building new schools before the need is at an even greater critical stage.</p> <p><b>11.2</b> It is acknowledged that the City has no direct control over school facility construction, and that regulating growth due to school impacts is prohibited by SB50. However, it is recommended that the Council direct the</p>	<p><b>11. <u>Schools</u></b></p> <p><b>Response from CVESD:</b> Chula Vista Elementary School District is committed to delivering new schools as quickly as possible, with funding and eligibility for state funding being the two impediments to immediate school construction.</p> <p><b>Response from SUHSD:</b> The district has and will continue to be extremely aggressive with school site construction and in identifying funding sources. The district has formed 15 Community Facility Districts and has received nearly \$90 million in State new construction funding for new school facilities in Eastlake, Rancho del Rey, Otay Ranch and other areas. The district is actively working with the City of Chula Vista on locating the next high school site within the Otay Ranch.</p> <p>The City will support the CVESD in their efforts to build additional schools.</p>

**APPENDIX A**  
**2002 GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS / IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS SUMMARY**

GMOC RECOMMENDATIONS	STAFF RESPONSES & PROPOSED IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS
<p>City Manager to coordinate City resources as appropriate and join with the CVESD in their on-going efforts to build a new elementary school in Otay Ranch Village 6 at the earliest time possible.</p> <p><b>11.3</b> That the CVESD endeavor to find creative financing to build three elementary schools in the next 2 years, one each at San Miguel Ranch, EastLake Woods, and Otay Ranch Village 6.</p> <p><b>11.4</b> Assuming that there is no change in the expected number of students as forecasted by the SUHSD, facilitating high school construction should be placed as the City Manager's highest priority when working with the SUHSD and developers to finalize site selection and to assure road and utility access to the site in a timely fashion. This will constitute the City's primary contribution to maintain the school threshold.</p> <p><b>11.5</b> The GMOC will consider the recommendations of the Schools Task Force and report to Council on or before next year's joint GMOC, City Council, Planning Commission workshop with a response.</p>	<p>Chula Vista Elementary School District will explore all financing options to support construction of three schools in the next two years. In any case the CVESD will build three additional schools in the San Miguel Ranch, Eastlake Woods/Eastlake Vistas, and Otay Ranch Village 6 sites in the next two or three years. The construction schedule is dependent on the availability of State Proposition 47 school construction funds and unhoused student eligibility as evaluated by the California Department of Education.</p> <p>City staff accepts recommendation.</p> <p>Response not required.</p>